

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, and 17-79 are pending. Claims 1, 32, 51, 52, 63, and 64 are amended. Claims 2 and 11-16 were cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 80-83 were withdrawn from consideration. The remaining claims are unchanged.

The amendments to the claims are supported by the application as originally filed, for instance, on page 22, paragraph 1089. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-10, 17-23, 25-56, 60-70, and 74-79 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious in view of Stewart et al. (US 2002/0019797), Ghoneimy et al. (US 2004/0078373), and Davis et al. (U.S. 6,260,062).

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the foregoing amendments and for the reasons below.

The Office Action states, on page 5, line 4, “Stewar[t]-Ghoneimy does not clearly teach logical routing of a message.” Applicant agrees with this assessment of Stewart and Ghoneimy.

The Office Action cites Davis for its description of logical routing. While Davis indeed mentions logical routing, Davis does not disclose or suggest all of the features of logical routing, as defined in claim 1. In particular, claim 1 recites:

**(b) determining a route path for delivery of said message to said one or more recipient services, said route path including one or more in-transit services, said determining being based on an evaluation of two or more routing scripts selected from the group consisting of: a routing script defined by a sending service, a routing script defined by a recipient service, and one or more routing scripts defined by one or more in-transit services, such that each service is capable of independently affecting said determining of said route path during a logical routing of said message represented by said evaluation.**

(Emphasis Added).

The determination of a route path in accordance with embodiments of claim 1 provides for the calculated route to be based on routing instructions specified explicitly in the message header and/or on routing scripts pre-defined by the sending service 310, recipient service 360, or any in-transit services 350 that have been included within the calculated route. (Application as originally filed, page 17, paragraph 1064). In-transit services may themselves have routing scripts requiring processing by other services. Therefore, the route calculation can be recursively defined based upon routing scripts specified by all services that interact with the message. (Application as originally filed, page 17, paragraph 1066).

Davis only describes a general “mapping” of a downstream element-independent message into an element-dependent message and protocol. (col. 5, lines 55-60). However, Davis

fails to disclose or suggest that such mapping involves “an evaluation of evaluation of two or more routing scripts selected from the group consisting of: a routing script defined by a sending service, a routing script defined by a recipient service, and one or more routing scripts defined by one or more in-transit services,” as recited in claim 1. There is simply no passage in Davis that discloses or even remotely suggests an evaluation of routing scripts, as recited in claim 1, to provide the described mapping of downstream or upstream messages.

Further, as clarified by the amendments above, the “logical routing” feature of claim 1 refers to the “routing of said message represented by said evaluation.” In other words, the logical routing is represented by the “evaluation of two or more routing scripts selected from the group consisting of: a routing script defined by a sending service, a routing script defined by a recipient service, and one or more routing scripts defined by one or more in-transit services,” as recited in claim 1. Davis describes a “logical transmission path” towards a network element (NE), but fails to disclose or suggest that such logical path is represented by an evaluation of routing scripts in the manner specified in claim 1. Because Davis fails to disclose or suggest this evaluation, as explained above, Davis also fails to teach the logical routing specified in claim 1.

Because Davis fails to cure the deficiencies of Stewart and Ghoneimy with respect to logical routing, the cited references, considered alone or in combination, fail to support the obviousness rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the outstanding obviousness rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 32, 51, 52, 63, and 64 have been amended to recite similar features as claim 1. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn for similar reasons as claim 1.

The rejections of the dependent claims should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which the respective sets of dependent claims are based. Applicant submits that the dependent claims also recite additional patentable features.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant believes the pending claims are allowable for the reasons above and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below if the Examiner has any remaining questions or concerns regarding the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/John F. Griffith/

John F. Griffith  
Reg. No. 44,137

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100